



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

TC

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/598,968	06/22/2000	Manfred Berndt	4481-021	8551

7590

04/08/2002

Allan M Lowe  
Lowe Hauptman Gopstein Gilman & Berner LLP  
1700 Diagonal Road  
Suite 310  
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

BROWN, JENNINE M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1743

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2002

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/598,968

Applicant(s)

BERNDT, MANFRED

Examiner

Jennine M. Brown

Art Unit

1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 15-17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-2 and 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chow, et al. (US 5989402).

Regarding claims 1-2, 6-7, and 11-14, Chow, et al. teach a removable microfluidic device called a "first interface component" or "first physical unit" or "first assembly" or "interface element" (10) inserted into an analysis system called "a second physical unit" or "material transport system" or "supply unit" (208) spatially separated from the first unit (Figure 2A) where second physical unit (208) provides material transport by controlling voltage through a control unit coupled to the fluid supply system (Figure 1A) whereby fluid and electrical charge

Art Unit: 1743

are supplied to the microfluidic device through the bayonets (204) called "coding elements" of the second physical unit which are aligned with the wells called "coding elements" of the microfluidic device which pierce a gasket and sensor for measuring voltage and/or optical energy within the microfluidic device (col. 17, l. 24-41; col. 4, l. 46-55; col. 7, l. 1-22; col. 18, l. 1 – col. 22, l. 63).

Regarding claim 8, Chow, et al. teach insulating coating in semiconductor substrate materials (col. 5, l. 64-67).

Regarding claim 9, Chow, et al. teach a ceramic substrate of "gallium arsenide and the like" (col. 5, l. 57-63).

Regarding claim 10, Chow, et al. teach polymeric materials for the substrate (col. 6, l. 1-21).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow, et al. (US 5989402) as applied to claims 1-2 and 6-14 above, and further in view of Shoji (1994).

Chow, et al. teach a device for operating a laboratory microchip as stated previously.

Chow, et al. do not specify the equivalence of supplying the channels with electrodes, mechanical energy and thermal energy.

Shoji, et al. teach the equivalence of supplying the channels with electrodes (Figure 2a), mechanical energy (Figure 1e) and thermal energy (Figure 2b) and in Section 6 – Flow control system for liquid and gas, pressurized fluids (Figure 34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include pumps and valves as well as electrodes to stimulate movement of fluids in a microfluidic device because electrodes, mechanical pumping and thermal energy are equivalent methods of pumping fluids and high temperature movement, thermal pumping, can be used when heating a substance is necessary for a chemical reaction or low temperature actuation is carried out by mechanical or electrical processes for analysis.

### ***Non-statutory Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re*

*Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

This provisional rejection might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the copending application was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by a showing of a date of invention for the instant application prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the copending application under 37 CFR 1.131. For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

Claims 1-17 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over claims 1-11 of co pending Application No. 09/595,420 which has a common inventor with the instant application. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both have been drawn to a System Operating a Microfluidic Chip with a Removable Interface.

Claims 1-12 and 14 in application **09/598968** specify a microfluidic chip and a device for receiving the microfluidic chip, supplying it with electrical power, and methods of fluid movement within the chip. Similarly, Claims 1-11 in application **09/595420** specify a microfluidic chip and a device for receiving the microfluidic chip, supplying it with electrical power, and methods of fluid movement within the chip. Claims 13 and 15-17 in application **09/598568** further specify two coding elements and a Hall sensor pair which controls a shut-off and warning device for the device for receiving the microfluidic chip.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the device of application **09/595420** would be considered encompassed by the device and improvements of application **09/598968**.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennine M. Brown whose telephone number is (703) 305-0435. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (703) 308-4037. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3599 for regular communications and (703) 305-3599 for After Final communications.


Application/Control Number: 09/598,968

Page 7

Art Unit: 1743

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

jmb  
April 4, 2002

  
Jill Warden  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1700